

The Review.

VOL. X.

ST. LOUIS, MO., JULY 16, 1903.

No. 28.

THE LYNCHING MADNESS.

BISHOP BUTLER once speculated on the possibility of a whole people going mad. That the general brain may suffer a lesion resulting in what looks like popular insanity, it might, indeed, be argued with a good deal of force. The early stages of lunacy in the form of "fads" and "crazes" often manifest themselves in whole communities; and, as we are unhappily seeing just now in the outbreak of barbarous lynchings, East and West, North and South, the thing sometimes mounts to acute mania.

An alienist might easily detect in the bearing and actions of the frenzied mobs many of the symptoms of dementia. There is the wild obsession, the insensate fury, the cries, the howls, the "fixed idea," the rage knowing no bounds. It is a point at which the psychology of the crowd most strikingly reflects the mental condition of the individual maniac. But the madness of the mob is worse than that of the single man, because it is infectious. One crazy band bent on murder incites another to bloody-mindedness. In these days of quick communication, impulses pass swiftly from one section of the land to another. It is like the inmates of adjoining padded cells in an asylum stirring each other up by the example of shrieking and foaming at the mouth. A mob at the South bellows, and presently another in Belleville, Ill., takes up the hoarse cry. Thence the mania passes on to Indianapolis, only to break out later with redoubled fury and with every refinement of cruelty at Wilmington and Evansville. We almost seem to be beholding the fancy of Butler come true, and an entire nation losing its reason.

This conception of the passion for lynching as a vast wave of madness, inundating people by the thousand, is one, it seems to us, which is fitted to heighten our sense of public peril, as we con-

front the startling phenomenon. Where it will declare itself next, no man can tell. It is the instant and urgent duty of all sane men, and of every community not yet bedlamized, to gather up all the resources we possess against this threatening evil which has already become a stinging national disgrace. For there is method in this madness. It takes its origin, as everybody can see, in the notion that there is one class of men beyond the pale of the law. Mind, we say class of men, not class of crimes. Not all bestial outrages or ferocious murders are punished by mob law and with every circumstance of atrocity, as was the horrible crime by the more horrible lynching in Delaware. The trembling brute who was burned to death spoke the simple truth when he told his tormentors that he would not have been dealt with in that savage fashion had he not been a negro. Not all monsters of depravity are black; yet where do we hear of the red fury of the mob turning upon white fiends? No, the idea is abroad that "niggers" may be hunted like wild beasts. Beginning by attempting to decitizenize them, we have passed on to considering them de-humanized. We deny them the inalienable rights of every human being under our laws. For the white criminal the orderly processes of the law, the court, the sentence, the noose; but for his fellow in crime—that is all he is—the colored man, there is nothing but the howling of the mob and the leaping flame.

This is the first and great warning which the lynching mania speaks to every man who will hear. Class prejudice is at the bottom of these ferocities. In Bessarabia it is the Jew who is the outlaw, and who may with impunity be massacred because he belongs to a hated class; in America it is the negro for whom the most sacred guarantees of the law simply do not exist. Discrimination against a man because of his race or color shows us, in the insensate mob at Wilmington, into what wild animals it turns human beings when it does its perfect work. And we have not the slightest security that such class prejudice, erected into the controlling passion of the mob, will stop with any particular race or color. Any day it may suddenly be declared, and adopted in practice, that other classes of men, other races, other colors, are fit only for lynching. When once you depart from the principle that all men as such have fundamental and equal rights, or from the duty of doing justice even upon the vilest under the strict forms of the law, you can not tell to what fearful and bloody consequences you may be driven.

That is really the alarming aspect of this invasion of old communities by the lynching habit. It threatens to burst the social bond itself and make us all cave-men again, every one taking justice into his own hand. "Rough justice" lynching has been called

by its apologists. We perceive the roughness, but not the justice. Society exists at all only because individuals agree to put their private griefs into the hands of the ministers of the law; and every attempt by individuals or by mobs—be they “mobs of gentlemen”—to wreak vengeance on their own account, is a stab at the life of society. How deep our shame as a nation should be at these awful barbarities, no one perhaps can fully perceive who does not read the foreign newspapers. The story of our lawless ways is telegraphed to them in all its ghastliness. Englishmen, Germans, and Frenchmen were thinking of Americans, at their breakfast tables the other morning, just as we were thinking a few weeks ago of the murderous Russians in Kishenev. The stain has come upon our country’s name at the very moment when we were loudest in protesting against the atrocities of others. It is like the French writer Linguet, declaring that the stories told by Tacitus of the cruelties of Tiberius were incredible, since they did “dishonor to human nature”; only to go out shortly and fall a victim himself to the more cruel September massacres. What a crushing *tu quoque* Russia can make to the President’s petition, if she chooses!

* * *

We have nothing to add to these timely and not altogether inept observations of the N.Y. *Evening Post* (June 25th), except the remark that a paper which daily proclaims it as a part of its mission to “inculcate just principles in religion, morals, and politics,” ought to probe deeper in such questions as this, which affect the moral character of our people. What is it that is thus brutalizing us? Were such degeneration possible if we were indeed what we pretend to be: a Christian nation?

The *Post* calls upon the nation to “gather up all the resources we possess against this threatening evil which has already become a stinging national disgrace.” What are these resources? Is there any one more powerful than that which we, as a people, most flagrantly neglect: the training of our youth in the principles of religion, which is the only sound basis of morality?

It is a poor philosophy of correction which does not penetrate to the root of an evil.

* * *

In reply to a pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Bogota, the government of the United States of Colombia has by official decree consecrated the republic to the Sacred Heart and ordained a special holyday in its honor, together with a collection, the proceeds of which are to go to the fund which the Archbishop is gathering for the erection of a great Sacred Heart church in the national capital. Colombia is what we claim to be—a Christian country.

TRADES UNIONISM vs. STATE OWNERSHIP.

This important question, which has already been discussed by us in a brief and academical way, is now a practical and burning one in Australia. In Victoria, the railroads are owned by the government, and in consequence of the recent labor troubles, the government forbade its railway employés to ally themselves with the "Trades Hall," which is for Victoria what the American Federation of Labor is for the United States.

Mr. Benjamin Hoare, who is on the spot, describes the resulting situation substantially as follows :

On the part of the men they say, and say quite truly, that they are members of a great trades union, and that unionism is the salt of industrial organization. Trades unionism is now recognized as a potent engine for raising and sustaining the status and dignity of labor. Why should these engine drivers and firemen of the Victorian railways be debarred from affiliation with the Trades Hall, which is the centre and focus of all labor organization in the State? To the men it seems that the very perfecting of their strength and influence demands that their individual bodies shall be connected with the central bodies. And the men ask, with no feigned indignation: "Are we to be slaves, that in our own time and leisure we can not dispose of ourselves as we think fit?"

That is one statement of the case. It is a strong one; but it is only an *ex parte* presentation. The government position is not less formidable. The government railways are a national asset, on which rests the stability of the State. Those railways belong to no section of the people. They belong to the whole people. They must be governed and managed for the whole people. They stand in this respect in quite a different position from that of any private industrial enterprise. Even a private firm has relations with so many people that its failure or collapse brings down many fortunes. But this government ownership of the railways, with its responsibility for paying £120,000 a month in interest, and with all the daily interests of the people dependent on its service, is a far more important thing. No single body of men may be permitted to hold the working of these lines at their will. Six months ago the engine drivers of Victoria let us all know that they held this power *in terrorem* over us. Some of them threatened to "stop the wheels going round." They did not carry out their threat because of public opinion being at the time overwhelmingly against them. But they left the public in no doubt that they refrained only for the time, and that they still hold the power of paralyzing the State at any moment when they may think their interests demand it.

I don't think the men themselves will demur to this statement

of the facts as they exist. At the present moment they have made it known that they have taken every precaution and thought out every eventuality for making themselves masters of the situation. They are quite sure, they say, that a general strike of the organized railway servants will paralyze all train running, which means the stoppage of State trade. They may be right in this, or they may be wrong. They assert it. The Minister denies it. It is not for me to pronounce as to this fact. What I am dealing with here is the contention of these public servants that they hold the power. They say they do hold it. They say that at any time they please, that is when they think they have sufficient motive, they can almost ruin £40,000,000 worth of State property, and jeopardize a hundred millions' worth of private interests. Of course they hold that they will never use this power except in self-defence, and that thus the power is safely resting in their hands.

But here again the government's view must be recollected. Ministers, representing not a few thousands of servants, but the whole body of the people, say this power ought not to reside in the hands of a small minority. It must reside in the majority alone, or the government which represents the majority. The Ministers point out that six months ago the railway men threatened to strike because of certain percentage reductions made in their pay by decree of the whole State electors. There was a case in which this small body thought for a time they had full warrant for putting their power into operation contrary to the interests of all other men. The Ministers therefore say that any such power, if held by railway servants, would be a perpetual peril and terror to the State. It might, if possessed, be used unjustly or capriciously at any moment. The many would be subordinate to the few. The servants of the State, in every great emergency, could become the State's masters, and responsible government would be at an end. The people would not govern themselves. They would be governed by a small minority of their own people.

That is what the government asserts when it says that it will not permit the railway men to affiliate with the Trades Hall. And let me say here that this view is not at all academic.

It must be plain, if we in Victoria permitted a body of 2,000 railway servants to obtain such a mastery of the railways that at any time they pleased they could "stop the wheels going round," the integrity of our self-government would be gone. The Ministers would have to perform their functions and conceive their policies, not in obedience to the whole people, but at the will of their masters, the railway servants.—

Would not the same situation develop in the United States if the government assumed the ownership of the railroads?

EVOLUTION OF THE SALOON.

The saloon of to-day is so essentially a product of modern life that the memory of men who have been in the business of selling liquor at retail for twenty-five or thirty years, goes back over the whole story of its growth. The change from the old-fashioned tavern, with its tap-room and parlor, to the modern saloon, with its bar and little shut-off back room, is one not only of form, but of reputation and standing in the community.

In the old tap-room there were always a large fire and a number of little tables, while the bar at one side was generally fenced in by a kind of wooden railing, something like that in a bank, and what was sold across it was drunk at the tables or standing before the fire, for there was not enough room for both serving and drinking in front of the bar itself. The tap-room was a kind of lounging-room in town as well as in the country, particularly for the poorer customers; the better class were more apt to stay in the front room, where their drinks were brought in to them. Gradually the bar grew, and the rest of the tap-room shrank, while the hotels drew off the richer class of customers. As the life of a town grew more strenuous, and the sense of pressure and lack of leisure became more pronounced, the habit of "perpendicular drinking" and of tossing off a drink in front of the bar, and then hurrying out, put an end to the old habit of lounging at a table and taking one's liquor slowly.

In our day the bar has become the main and practically only feature of the long narrow room of which most saloons in our large cities consist. The more respectable saloon-keepers regret this state of affairs. Of late years a number of them have put in little tables, and they encourage customers to sit down. This is not done at all in imitation of the beer-gardens, which have grown up beside the saloons and occupy quite a distinctive field, but because the saloon-keepers think, many of them, that it gives a more respectable tone to their establishments, and they would rather have tables in front in plain sight than shut off in a little room. Modern saloons had some time ago lost most of the old tap-room character of social meeting-places, and had become essentially a place for drinking; to this some of their proprietors attribute the fact that it has come to be considered by many people a disgrace to go into a bar, whereas in former times no such sentiment existed. The honor in which taverns were held in the early colonial times, not as drinking-places, but as places of social re-union, where distances in the almanacs were frequently stated from tavern to tavern, instead of from town to town, is familiar to every student of American history. Then, indeed, the amount of liquor to be drunk by one man at the inn was carefully regulated, and the tavern itself,

as a club, a hotel, and even on occasions a meeting-house, was under the close supervision of the authorities.

The constitutional objection of Germans to drinking on their feet has been one cause, among others, of the growth of beer-gardens here, but these have not essentially affected the character of saloons. The bar with a passageway in front of it, into which the saloon has developed, is thoroughly American, and as much the result of our life here as is the quick-lunch counter, which is its counterpart. The revival of some of the old sociable tap-room features would unquestionably raise the general tone of saloons, but many people who are interested in the question feel that a more effective improvement would be made by the substitution of something else for the saloon. The café, as it exists in France, particularly the sidewalk café, never seems to have taken root in this country, even in that season of the year to which it is adapted.

A prominent retail liquor-dealer says that one reason why many people go into saloons, particularly on Sunday morning, is because of the lack of public toilet conveniences. It has been observed that nearly 50 per cent. of those who drop in at a saloon for this reason stay or have a drink. If our large cities were not worse provided in this respect than other cities of one-quarter their size in the world, a great many drinks would be lost to the saloons.



IS THERE NEED OF A NEW CATECHISM ?

There is no dearth of catechisms, old or new, yet a clerical critic in the *Providence Visitor* (No. 35) complains that we have no catechism suitable for a working-boy who comes a few weeks before Corpus Christi to be prepared for his first communion on Corpus Christi, and is then more or less left to himself.

The reverend editor of the *Visitor* agrees with his critic on the defectiveness of the Baltimore Catechism, "hastily prepared nearly twenty years ago, during the last sessions of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore;" but he questions the need of a new catechism, "though, of course, we should welcome anything that made for precision, simplicity, and clearness in the manuals to which we are accustomed."

The *Visitor* thinks, catechisms are exceedingly difficult to write. In the first six centuries they were left to intellectual giants such as Cyril of Jerusalem, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, Augustine. In Reformation times the learning of a Blessed Peter Canisius supplied the want. His little manual has seen more than a hundred editions and is still used in many places in

the Fatherland. "There were many who regretted that it was not officially enjoined as a model by the Fathers of the Baltimore Council....."

"What is really needed, almost, if not quite, as much as a new catechism," he thinks, "is a new order of catechists and a new spirit in their work. We are getting beyond the period when any exemplary young man or maiden, who has reached the years of discretion in a parish, is considered good enough to impart Sunday school instruction to the young. The whole business of catechetical teaching is growing to such proportions that it may well be doubted whether an hour or two on Sunday can be accepted as meeting its needs. The excellent Manual of Instruction prepared by Father Spirago and translated by Bishop Messmer for use in this country..... is a much wiser step towards reform, it seems to us, than any attempt at multiplying the catechisms at present in use. No printed page, no cut-and-dried formulary can ever dispense with the living teacher where Catholicism is concerned. Everything that tends to stimulate fertility and inventiveness in the catechist, while lessening the drudgery of unintelligent memory-work on the part of the taught, is a step in the right direction. As for the special difficulty created by the circumstances amid which the modern working-boy is condemned to prepare for his first communion, we are of the opinion that not even a new book would remove it. He must be brought back to the Sunday school for at least three years after his confirmation; some would make it five. If such subsequent attendance can not be secured, we shall be obliged to confess that we are in the habit of admitting whole classes to the sacraments who are morally certain to fall away after their initial grace. That is a problem for Church councils to meet; but meanwhile we must enlist the services of the working-boy's family on our side; we must compel his parents, his grown-up sisters, his sweethearts, even, to make common cause with the Church; and do everything in our power to make the first communion class something more than a beautiful episode in a difficult and otherwise menaced life."

Thus far the *Visitor*. As for ourselves, we should have preferred to distinguish from the outset between a catechism as a help in oral religious instruction, and a manual of religion. A catechism in its formal questions and answers, even if they are very precise, simple, and clear, can not impart warmth and edification; these qualities must come from the teacher. It is quite different with a manual of religion. And in that line Spirago's 'Katholischer Volkskatechismus' or Spirago-Clarke's 'Popular Catechism,' published by Benziger Brothers, will answer in full. All the objection that can be raised against the English edition,

is the price, \$2.50. A cheap edition at a dollar or a dollar and a quarter is needed. The Benzigers publish some very commendable books, such as the Little Life of the Saints and Goffine's Explanation of the Epistles and Gospels at a moderate price, why can they not offer Spirago-Clarke at a reasonable figure? If they will not or can not, we suggest that a new translation be made and printed by some other Catholic publishing house.

38 38 38

THE "SHOCK OF ENLIGHTENMENT" IN AMERICAN FREEMASONRY.

"The material light which sprung forth at the fiat of the Grand Architect, when darkness and chaos were dispersed, has been ever, in Masonry, a favorite symbol of that intellectual illumination which it is the object of the Order to create in the minds of its disciples, whence we have justly assumed the title of the 'Sons of Light.' This mental illumination, this spiritual light, which after his new birth, is the first demand of the new candidate, is but another name for divine truth—the truth of God and the soul—the nature and essence of both—which constitutes the *chief design of all Masonic teaching*. And as the chaos and confusion in which 'in the beginning,' 'the earth, without form and void' was enrapt, were dispersed and order and beauty established by the supreme command that established material light; so at the proper declaration and in the due and recognized form the intellectual chaos and confusion in which the mind of the neophyte is involved, are dispersed, and the true knowledge of the science and philosophy, the faith and doctrine of Masonry, are developed" (Mackey's Masonic Ritualist, p. 33).

Here then you have a clear statement of what Masonry pretends to do. It pretends to create a spiritual light in the mind of every candidate. It pretends to impart divine truth—the truth of God and of the soul—the nature and essence of both. This spiritual light, this divine truth is found in Masonry alone. You must enter its portals to know God and his essence, to know the nature and essence of your own soul. Are you shocked by the enlightenment? So proportionally was the world of material darkness and chaos when material light was created. Every man who is not initiated, cleric or layman, bishop or pope, is in intellectual chaos and darkness as regards the true nature of God and of the human soul. This is Masonry's benevolence which would free minds from religious error and substitute for ignorance divine truth.

Wonderful benevolence! But what are its proofs of the profound

ignorance of everybody else, and of its own transcendent wisdom? Its own unsubstantiated "*Ipse dico*"—I say so—that is enough. Truly a great intellectual change must be operated in a sane man to swallow all this without evident proofs. He must deny his own reason; for reason has demonstrated to him the existence and nature and attributes of the Supreme Being; he must deny every form of divine faith which he has hitherto professed; for according to Masonry every form outside its own is ignorant of divine truth—the nature and essence of God and of the human soul. This is a fundamental Masonic dogma. He must blindly accept all that Masonry will tell him, for all repugnance must be attributed to the errors and helplessness and ignorance of the past, to the chaotic confusion that reigns in his intellect. He must die to the past to be born into Masonic life. And this is what contains no harm for Catholics! This is what the Church must countenance in her children! She must permit them to turn their backs upon her and insult her; she must let them call her an imposter, since she presents herself to the world as "the pillar and ground of truth," when she does not even know, according to Masonry, the nature of God or of the human soul; she must permit all her work to be undone; she must permit another to supplant her in their affections; and while they on their part are dead to her, since they have cut every tie that bound them to her; while they seek in their hearts to extinguish the past, to live another life not her's; while they press forward to an eternity which she reprobates, worship a god whom she abhors; she, their mother, must stand by indifferent, or to avoid the accusation of ignorance and bigotry and superstition, must approve all this for at best a doubtful transitory advantage.

She will not, she can not do it; nor will any fair-minded man, understanding the case, ask her to do it? The shepherd gives his life for his sheep when the hireling flies; and the Church is more than a shepherd, she is a mother.

And here, as the eye of a Catholic priest roams over these pages, let him realize more fully why it is so difficult, even on a death-bed, to reclaim a Catholic who has been a Mason. The difficulty is not a mere moral one, it is an intellectual one. It is not merely disobedience to the Church and the neglect of her sacraments; it is a formal and complete apostasy in which the very God of Christianity is denied, as well as the very nature and essence of the Christian soul. What is there to work on? Without a miracle of divine grace, nothing. Were it passion or interest or other worldly and temporal motives that had led the heart astray, while leaving at least the roots of faith intact, the nearness of eternity and the fear of an offended God might again revive what long had

lain dormant and as dead ; but when the very roots of Christian faith have been cut and all past ties are broken, when the great intellectual change of Masonry has produced its baneful effects, and not one single dogma, but the whole Catholic system has been cast aside as error, helplessness, and ignorance, the case, as Masonry knows and as it has cunningly planned, is wellnigh hopeless. If there be any human hope it will be in understanding the source whence springs the lack of responsiveness in one who should be a Catholic ; and in seeking to recall what has been so sedulously banished, the truths of divine faith that he had learned at his mother's knee.

What we say of the anti-Christian nature of Masonry, on the testimony of Masonry itself, should also open the eyes of every Protestant that loves his church, to the dangers that threaten it from Masonry. Methodism, Presbyterianism, Episcopalianism, and all the other Protestant forms are, in the eyes of the craft, as devoid of divine truth as is Catholicity. Only in Masonry are we taught the nature and essence of God, the nature and essence of the human soul ; outside the lodge all is error. The various Protestant churches have, therefore, if they are sincere in the faith which they profess, the very same reason for condemning Masonry that the Catholic Church has. Masonry will indeed embrace them all, as the wolf will embrace every lamb that it comes across, with the inevitable result of all wolf and no lamb. The Catholic Church knows the danger ; the Catholic Church, regardless of consequences to herself, fearlessly proclaims the danger ; let sincere and candid Protestants compare her action with the supineness of their own clergy in reference to Masonry, nay with the too frequent positive connivance, and then decide themselves where is the true guardian of the faith of Christ.



BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

St. Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury. His Life as Told by Old English Writers. Arranged by Bernard Ward, President of St. Edmund's College, Old Hall. St. Louis: B. Herder. 1903. Price \$1.60.

This life is a compilation from old Latin chronicles. In translating the extracts the author has adhered as closely as possible to the originals, and the style of the book has in consequence a quaint simplicity, a flavor of antiquity, which contributes in no small degree to the life-like impression produced on the reader's

imagination. The reality of the portrait is further heightened by the numerous well-chosen illustrations, which are fully explained in the appendix. Altogether Msgr. Ward has presented a unique life of one of England's greatest saints, a saint who played an important part in the history of his times and inspired for centuries the fervent devotion of his countrymen. When England slew her prophets and stoned those that were sent unto her, St. Edmund continued to be honored and invoked by the faithful in France. Now that the Church in England has risen from her ashes, the Saint has come unto his own again, and will be once more the great patron and lofty model of the Catholic scholars of "Mary's Dowry."



Catholic London Missions from the Reformation to the Year 1805.

By Johanna H. Harting. London: Sands & Co. St. Louis: B. Herder. 1903. Price \$2.

An account of the chapels in which the faithful met in London, surreptitiously for the most part, during the long years when Catholic worship was proscribed in England. Most of these chapels belonged to the embassies from foreign countries, and for a long time it was under foreign protection that the London Catholic managed to perform his religious duties, if indeed he managed it at all. The book can not fail to be of interest, but this interest would have been enhanced had the matter been arranged in a more orderly way.



—Realizing the pernicious influence which Socialism exercises in so many spheres, the German Catholic *Districts-Verband* of Chicago last February inaugurated a series of lectures in that city, to show the masses that modern Socialism is the most absurd remedy yet suggested for existing social evils and that the Catholic Church alone teaches the only true and sure way to social happiness, as she has always done. Rev. Dr. Heiter of Buffalo lectured in Chicago, and the force of his arguments was remarkable. The *Priester-Verein* has now published his lectures in pamphlet form and is endeavoring to spread them far and wide, appealing especially to Catholic societies to encourage the reading of this literature. An English translation is contemplated for English speaking Catholics. The pamphlet is entitled 'Sieben Vorträge gegen Socialdemokratie' and sells at 10 cents per copy, \$7 per 100, \$25 per 500. Address: Secretary of Deutscher Katholischer Priester-Verein, Rev. Ed. Berthold, 247 Le Moyne St., Chicago, Ill.



MINOR TOPICS.

It is unfortunate that the *Denver Catholic*, this self-constituted champion of the faulty "insurance" system of the C. M. B. A., in criticizing our comments on the business methods of the Catholic fraternal, does not confine itself to a calm discussion of the facts presented, but prefers to go about hair splitting by taking up unimportant matters without touching the real question involved. For the information of our readers and the *Denver Catholic* we wish to emphatically state that all the figures given in our insurance articles are obtained from *official* sources, and we usually quote our authorities. Now here is an example of the way the *Denver Catholic* (No. 15) misinforms its readers:

"THE REVIEW asserted that the C. M. B. A. did not do any business in Pennsylvania. Now, the fact is, as the *Denver Catholic* asserted, that next to New York, Pennsylvania has the greatest number of members of the C. M. B. A. of any State in the Union. Thereupon THE REVIEW quoted some insurance report. Now, this did not really deny what the *Denver Catholic* said, but it did give the impression to the uninformed that the *Denver Catholic* was wrong."

The C. M. B. A. is a regularly chartered fraternal organization under the laws of the State of New York. The insurance laws of Pennsylvania provide explicitly under what conditions such outside corporations can do business in the State, and one of the conditions is to obtain a *license of authority for doing business* from the State Insurance Department. Detailed reports of the business done and the financial standing of the concerns are also required, and these are published in the Insurance Commissioner's annual report for the information of the proper authorities and the public at large.

Such being the case, it was natural that, in order to answer the *Denver Catholic's* claim of the large Pennsylvania business of the C. M. B. A., THE REVIEW wrote to the Pennsylvania Insurance Department, not to "some" department, but to the Insurance Department of *Pennsylvania*. The reply was that "the C. M. B. A. is *not* authorized to do business in Pennsylvania, and the Department is in ignorance regarding its financial standing."

The "Catholic Benevolent Legion" does business in Pennsylvania, is properly authorized, and its annual reports are regularly published by the Department. The C. M. B. A. *can not be found* in the Department's publications, and therefore THE REVIEW did say that it had no standing in Pennsylvania. *Officially it has not*, and if the *Denver Catholic's* claim is correct, (and we have no further means of testing it, *official authorities prove the contrary*), we sincerely regret that a *Catholic* order is deliberately doing work in the State of Pennsylvania in utter disregard and *direct violation* of the laws of that State passed for the protection of members.

To the members of Catholic fraternal in general, and to the C. M. B. A. and the *Denver Catholic* in particular, we recommend a *careful* study of the report of the Committee on Revision of Rates appointed by the Catholic Order of Foresters and published after

two years' study of the subject of fraternal insurance, on May 1st, 1903. We quote a few passages as conclusion of our remarks for the benefit of all concerned :

"Two things were, however, shown to the satisfaction of the committee by the history of fraternal organizations on their insurance or protection side, namely:

"a. That notwithstanding oft repeated assertions and opinions of many advocates that rates once in vogue were high enough to mature their contracts, the course of short time proved that they were not ; and

"b. As far as the history of insurance goes, that any and all plans which failed to provide for payment in advance yearly or monthly, of a sufficient sum, which, properly invested and increased, would accumulate enough to meet the contracts when due, failed in their final outcome."



Once more "the organ on Holy Thursday":

We have received this note from the Rector of the Provincial Seminary of St. Francis, at St. Francis, Wisconsin :

Allow me to refer once more to the controversy raised in your columns on the use of the organ on Holy Thursday. Rev. Dr. Baart (No. 26) tries to prove from the wording of the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* that the organ may be used during the whole mass. His argument might be considered convincing if the plain words of a late decree of the S. C. of Rites would not state the contrary. As the latter is the case, I suppose we have to apply the rule that general decrees may be and are modified and limited by particular decrees. I quote from the latest edition of Gardellini's "Decreta Authentica": "Ad Dubium VII. Quum in variis ecclesiis etiam insignibus iuxta immemorabilem consuetudinem pulsatur Organum per totam missam in Feria V. in Coena Domini ; quaeritur : Num servari possit talis consuetudo haud facile abrumpenda ? Resp. Invetam consuetudinem esse eliminandam. In Urgellensi, die 30. Dec. 1881, No. 3535."—From this I would infer that the words of the *Caeremoniale* "*In missa*" are to be understood in the sense of the above decree, i. e., that the organ should not be played during the whole mass, but only to the end of the Gloria according to the rubrics and another decree of the same Congregation, No. 3515 ad IV.—J. Rainer.

Prof. J. Singenberger submits the following : In the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, *Editio typica*, 1886, and *Editio prima post typicam* 1902, I read : "Item feria quinta in Coena Domini ad Gloria in excelsis Deo et Sabbato sancto ad Gloria in excelsis Deo."

So it must have been an antiquated edition of the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* from which Rev. Dr. Baart quoted in our No. 26.



During the recent strike in the anthracite coal region, much sympathy was created for the striking miners by the plea that, owing to the insufficient earnings of the fathers of families, their children were compelled to work in the mines. The Philadelphia legislature came to the rescue by passing a law prohibiting the employment of minors under sixteen years of age in work under ground. While intended only for the anthracite region (so the

miners thought) the law actually applies to any and all coal mines in the commonwealth. Strange to say, now trouble is threatened all over the State, because the officials of the Department of Mines purpose to enforce the law (see *Philadelphia Record*, June 27th).

The bituminous coal miners were the first to protest and are greatly encouraged by a majority of the miners in the anthracite region; there is talk of getting a test case before the Supreme Court in the hope that said body will find the law unconstitutional.

But what becomes of the objection to child labor in the mines, so effectually used during the great strike for creating sympathy and getting financial aid in the struggle for better terms? It looks as if the miners did not want other people's children to work, only their own.

According to the *Chicago Tribune* there were 2516 lynchings from 1885 to and including 1900, and there are now but four States (Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Utah) left in which no such crime ever took place. The mistaken impression that "lynch law" is gradually dying out, is corrected by the *Tribune's* tables. There were 90 lynching in 1881 and 135 in 1901. Between these years the number shifted back and forth, going as high as 235 in 1892.

The apologists for "lynch law" claim that the regular process of justice is too slow and the result too uncertain to suit the masses in case of certain crimes; so they propose to make sure of the criminal's punishment. If there is any truth in this assertion, it seems to us that the laws should be changed and more rigidly enforced. Whatever the cause, it is a sad reflection on a government "of, by, and for the people," that these very people do not trust the laws of their own making, nor the law officers of their own choosing, to punish criminals as they deserve. There would seem to be a large field here for missionary work by those who are so anxious to educate the Christian Filipinos to the standard of "American civilization."

"And still they come." Now the order of United Workmen is framing a new schedule of insurance rates, largely increasing the present figures. (Cfr. *Philadelphia Record*, June 21st.)

The proposal to send Plymouth Rock on a triumphal tour of the country, though it be only a product of journalistic imagination, is full of suggestion. If this rock is moved from its firm base, others will follow its example. It would be but common courtesy for Bunker Hill monument to return the recent call of the Liberty Bell. It is large, to be sure, but could doubtless be divided into sections and put on the cars. The problem of carrying the Washington monument west for inspection by the farmers of Iowa and Nebraska differs from this only in degree. Such things have been done. Libby prison was taken bodily to Chicago some years ago. It used to be accepted as a matter of course

that every one would go to his grave without having seen some of the interesting objects even in his native country. But the founders of the new "movements" appear to insist that if John Smith can not go to see the famous and historic objects, they shall be brought to him.—

Meanwhile we Catholics, who are accustomed to being ridiculed as "relic-worshippers," are wondering what this latest craze among Protestant and infidel Americans will lead to.

Cardinal Kopp, Prince-Bishop of Breslau, has issued a rule requiring all newly-ordained priests to spend six weeks in a Prussian normal training college before entering upon the duties of the ministry, in order to obtain a practical insight into the whole system of primary education. "This," says the *Catholic Telegraph*, (No. 26) "is a capital idea. Those who are to have charge of parochial schools, should have as much knowledge of practical pedagogy as possible. Diocesan school boards, teachers' institutes, and the requirement that every teacher shall undergo an examination, has done much to raise parochial schools in many parts of the United States to a splendid position of efficiency, but, alas! a large number of dioceses and some archdioceses are backnumbers in the educational line."

A subscriber in Rochester, N. Y., writes: To the reasons given in No. 25, "Why Irishmen Are True To Their Faith," allow me to add the following: Because in Ireland the introduction and propagation of Protestantism was attempted by a foreign power very odious to the people; whereas in England, Germany, Sweden, etc., this was done by the home governments of those countries. This, humanly speaking, is the most potent reason why Irishmen are truer to their faith than other nations; the fact is a political one.—Fr. H. Sinclair, D. D.

In the light of our late article on "The Transformation of a City," contributed by a scholarly New Yorker, the following paragraph from an editorial in the N. Y. *Sun* of June 23rd will prove interesting:

"The old Christian demand that the secularization of education should not go to the extent of excluding the reading of the Bible in schools, has been succeeded by a Jewish demand for their de-christianization. New York can no longer be regarded as a Christian city."

We learn from Rev. P. Heribert Holzapfel, O. F. M., through the courtesy of our esteemed friend Rt. Rev. Msgr. P. M. Baumgarten, that the material for the thesis which asserts the untenableness of the legend of the Holy House of Loreto has been gathered by Professor G. Hüffer of the University of Munich and will soon be published by that scholarly writer. P. Holzapfel regrets that, being bound by a promise to Professor Hüffer, he can not furnish us this material before the publication of the latter's book.

